Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives Effective 2009-2010 & 2010-2011 School Year

Requirements

Title I and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) require schools to provide high quality instruction to limited English proficient students to help them meet both academic growth targets and English language proficiency standards. As required under ESEA, the Alaska State Department of Education and Early Development has set Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for LEP students in districts that receive Title III funds. The purpose of the AMAOs is to measure student development and attainment of English proficiency while meeting challenging state academic content and student academic achievement standards. [Section 3122(a)]

Three Parts of Title III AMAOs

- 1. Make progress in learning English (MP),
- 2. Attain proficiency in the English language (AP), and
- 3. Make adequate yearly progress (AYP) on required state content assessments.

AMAO Targets

The percent of all identified LEP students expected to Make Progress and Attain Proficiency per year. (Newly identified LEP students who have only taken the annual ELP assessment once will not be included for consideration of making progress.)

Year	Making Progress in English	Attaining Proficiency in English	Language Arts Target (AYP)	Math Target (AYP)
2009-2010	37%	15%	77.18%	66.09%
2010-2011	40%	16%	82.88%	74.57%

Definition of Proficient

A student is proficient in English if he or she obtains an overall standard score at the Proficient or Proficient High level on the ELP Assessment. The standard scores for each level are adopted in Alaska regulation 4 AAC 34.055. Attaining proficiency once on the ELP assessment is the criteria to be exited from the LEP designation. (*Effective February*, 2007)

Definition of Making Progress

An LEP student will be considered to have made progress in learning English if he or she has reached or exceeded his or her making progress goal for the year, or has attained proficiency. The making progress goal for each year is the difference between the student's overall proficiency target and the student's current standard overall score, divided by the number of expected years left to reach proficiency.

The number of expected years to reach proficiency in English is set according to the grade level and the level of overall proficiency during the initial year of assessment on the annual state English Language Proficiency Assessment, as shown in the following chart. The proficiency target is set at the minimum standard score at the grade level of expected overall proficiency. Each year the making progress goal for the next year (amount of progress on the standard score that student is expected to make each year) is calculated by finding the difference between the proficiency target and the student's current year overall standard score, divided by the number of years remaining to reach proficiency. Progress and Proficiency are reported in the IPT test results to districts.

Number of Expected Years to Reach Overall Proficiency in English								
Student	Overall Proficiency Level at Initial Identification as LEP							
Grade Level at Initial Identification as LEP	Beginner Low	Beginner High	Intermediate Low	Intermediate High				
K	6	5	4	3				
1st	6	5	4	3				
2nd	6	5	4	3				
3rd	6	5	4	3				
4th	6	5	4	3				
5th	6	5	4	3				
6th	7	6	5	4				
7th	7	6	5	4				
8th	7	6	5	4				
9th	7	6	5	4				
10th	7	6	5	4				
11th	7	6	5	4				
12th	7	6	5	4				

All districts receiving Title III funds are accountable for meeting the AMAO objectives.

Consequences of not meeting Title III AMAO targets

• If AMAO targets are not met for one year:

- Parents of Title III served students must be notified of the failure of the district to meet the AMAOs within 30 days of district notification by EED. [3302 (b)]
- Parents must be notified each year that the AMAOs are not met.

• If AMAO targets are not met for 2 years in a row:

- District must develop and implement an improvement plan addressing the targets not met and factors preventing district from achieving the target objective(s). [3122(b)(2)]
- EED must provide technical assistance to districts.

• If AMAO targets are not met for 4 years in a row:

- District must develop and implement an improvement plan addressing the targets not met and factors preventing district from achieving the target objective(s). [3122(b)(2)]
- EED must provide technical assistance to districts.
- EED must choose one of the following options: [3122(b)(4)]
 - require the district to modify the curriculum, program, and method of instruction;

OR

- determine whether the district will continue to receive Title III funds and require that the district replace educational personnel relevant to its failure to meet the AMAOs.

Alaska Prior AMAO Targets

Year	Grades	Making Progress	Attaining Proficiency	Language Arts Target	Math Target (AYP)	See Notes
		in English	in English	(AYP)	(1111)	Below
2008-2009	K-12	60%	20%	77.18%	66.09%	В
2007-2008	K-12	56%	19%	77.18%	66.09%	В
2006-2007	K-12	35%	18%	71.48%	57.61%	С
2005-2006	K-12	80%	17%	71.48%	57.61%	D
2004-2005	6-12	77%	21%	71.48%	57.61%	Е
2004-2005	K-5	77%	10%	71.48%	57.61%	Е
2003-2004	6-12	75%	20%	64.03%	54.85%	Е
2003-2004	K-5	75%	8%	64.03%	54.85%	Е

Notes and History of AMAO Targets

- A. The Making Progress and Attaining Proficiency Targets for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 were reset based on trends from actual data from the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 school years.
- B. The Making Progress targets for 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 were changed to reflect the students that made progress **and** those that attained proficiency on the ELP assessment, so the total percents were adjusted to include the original making progress target and the original attaining proficiency target (of 56% = 37% + 19% for 2007-2008 and 60% = 40% + 20% for 2008-2009).
- C. The state proposed new AMAO targets for 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 that reflected making progress from one year to the next on the new ELP assessment that began in 2006. The criteria to exit LEP status was changed in spring 2007 to scoring at the overall proficient level once on the ELP assessment. The making progress target for 2006-2007 of 35% represented the percent of *all identified LEP students* who made progress on the test, *but who had not yet attained proficiency*. The attaining proficiency target of 18% represented the percent of *all identified LEP students* who attained proficiency on the ELP assessment (and thus exited LEP status).
- D. The AMAO targets for 2005-2006 did not change except to incorporate one target for attaining proficiency for all students grades K-12 rather than separate targets for separate grade spans, for ease of reporting purposes.
- E. These are the original AMAO targets for school years 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. The target for making progress represented the percent of the *group of LEP students not yet proficient on the ELP assessment* that had made the expected level of progress as determined by their grade level and current proficiency level. The targets for attaining proficiency represented the percent of *all identified LEP students* that attained proficiency on the ELP assessment. The criteria to exit LEP status was two consecutive years of proficiency on the ELP assessment *and* proficient on the reading and writing content assessments at least once.